

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

Docket: 3816.04-D3  
May 10, 2007 (12:15pm)

MAY 10 2007

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION

*I hereby certify that this correspondence is, on the date below, being facsimile transmitted to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office (Fax. No. 571-283-8300)*

Date: 10 May 2007

Ingrid C. Mallory

Ingrid C. Mallory

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

**In re Application of:** James E. Boyle et al.

**Attorneys Docket:** 3816.04-D3

**Serial No.:** 10/652,677

**Confirmation No.:** 2556

**Filed:** August 29, 2003

**Art Unit No.:** 3726

**Examiner:** E. Omgba

**For:** "SILICON TOWER WITH INCLINED SUPPORT TEETH"

---

Commissioner for Patents  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**SECOND REPLY BRIEF UNDER 37 CFR §41.41**

Sir:

This Reply Appeal Brief is filed in support of the appeal of the above application dated December 27, 2005 and in response to the second Examiner's Answer dated March 26, 2007.

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTERDocket: 3816.04-D3  
May 10, 2007 (12:15pm)

MAY 10 2007

## REMARKS

The second Examiner's Answer dated March 26, 2007 replicates the first Examiner's Answer dated December 4, 2006 with the only apparent exceptions of a new signature page and the inclusion of an initialed Form 1449. The second Examiner's Answer does not acknowledge the Reply Brief filed January 31, 2007, which the USPTO acknowledged by facsimile as being received that day.

The arguments of the first Reply Brief will not be repeated but are confirmed. Very generally, (1) the minimization of contact area to a point contact promoted by Hewitt for glazed pottery is counterproductive in thermal processing of silicon wafer and (2) fabricational advantages need to be considered in the considering the advantages and non-obviousness of product claims.

## CONCLUSION

Accordingly, for the reasons presented in the Appeal Brief and the first Reply Brief, base claims 1, 10, 17, and 24 and all claims dependent therefrom should be held allowable. Dependent claims 4, 7, and 13 should be held additionally allowable. Dependent claim 16 should also be allowable because of the lack of a detailed rejection.

The Board is respectfully requested to instruct the Examiner to allow these claims.

Date: 10 May 2007  
Correspondence Address  
Law Offices of Charles Guenzer  
2211 Park Blvd.  
P.O. Box 60729  
Palo Alto, CA 94306

Respectfully submitted,

  
Charles S. Guenzer  
Registration No. 30,640  
(650) 566-8040